

## **REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 18, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 18, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraphs [0006], [0032], [0043], [0044], and [0047]-[0049] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 1-59 are pending in the application. Claims 1-59 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 37-47 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brook* (U.S. Patent Application Publication, published March 28, 2002) [hereinafter "*Brook*"].

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner takes the position that *Brook* teaches or suggests a method of testing content, comprising: parsing, by a parser, two or more documents in tandem on an element-by-element basis, whereby the elements of each of the documents are sequentially parsed; upon parsing each of the respective sequential elements in a first document of the two or more documents and each of the

other documents, comparing the respective parsed elements to one another; and on the basis of the comparison, determining whether the documents are at least equivalent.

The Examiner maintains that parsing two or more documents by elements is taught by *Brook* at [0002] and [0206]-[0225]. However, these paragraphs are directed towards parsing a single document using a hash function to validate the well-formedness and syntax of a markup language document. *Brook* does not teach or suggest parsing two or more documents by elements to determine if the elements of the documents are equivalent.

Also, the Examiner contends that *Brook* teaches parsing and comparison for purposes of comparison and validation, which is determining whether the documents are at least equivalent at [0236]. However, this paragraph is directed towards a validation check being a more detailed form of checking syntax than well-formedness checking, because while both check for tags being properly nested, validation checking also checks the hierarchical relationship of the tags to see if a tag should have been nested under another. Therefore, this portion of *Brook* is directed towards validating the form of one particular document, not comparing two documents to see if they are equivalent. On these bases alone, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn, and request that claim 1 and its dependents be allowed.

Further, the Examiner concedes that *Brook* does not teach parsing two documents in tandem, but maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because *Brook* teaches parsing two documents element by element and comparing the documents for validation at [0060]-[0069]. However, these paragraphs are directed towards an apparatus for validating a markup language document against a validation reference document (VRD) to make sure the syntax and structure is proper. Therefore, this portion of *Brook* is directed towards establishing the validity of the form of the markup language document, not towards comparing two documents against each other for validation.

Therefore, with respect to the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn, and request claim 1 and its dependents be allowed.

With respect to independent claim 14, the Examiner takes the position that *Brook* teaches or suggests a method of testing and validating user interface content, comprising: submitting a request to an application; in response to the request, receiving a response document from the application; retrieving from storage a control document previously returned from the application in response to the request; sequentially determining each element of the response document and the control document; for at least some of the respective sequentially determined elements from the respective documents, comparing the elements to one another; and on the basis of the comparison, determining whether the elements are equivalent.

With respect to these elements, the Examiner relies on *Brook* as applied to claim 1, with the exception that the Examiner asserts that paragraphs [0014]-[0274] teach comparison of a parsed document against a control document, which (the Examiner argues) is taught as a VRD. However, as pointed out above with respect to claim 1, *Brook* does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, the rejection of claim 14 is believed to be traversed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn, and request that claim 14 and its dependents be allowed.

Likewise, with respect to independent claim 31, the Examiner takes the position that *Brook* teaches or suggests all the claim limitations for the reasons set out for claim 1, as well as paragraphs [0227]-[0259] which the Examiner asserts as teaching a first test for validation and a second test for error checking. However, *Brook* does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations for the above reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claim 31 is believed to be traversed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn, and request that claim 31 and its dependents be allowed.

The Examiner takes the position that independent claim 49 is substantially similar subject matter as dependent claim 2 and thus rejects it along the same lines. However,

because *Brook* does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, the rejection of claim 31 is believed to be traversed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn, and request that claim 49 and its dependents be allowed.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/  
Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)